

REMARKS

Claims 2-11 are present in this application. Claims 2 and 9 are independent claims. Claim 1 has been canceled, thus, all issues related to claim 1 no longer apply.

102(b) REJECTION – Honore

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,551,065 (Honore). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2 and 9

Embodiments covered by claim 2 are directed to a wireless transmission/reception card (e.g., Fig. 1) supporting apparatus comprising:

a mount (e.g., slot 5, 6 in headset 4) on which a wireless transmission/reception card is mounted,

said wireless transmission/reception card comprises a pole-shaped antenna (e.g., pole-shaped antennas 2, 3) having a longitudinal axis along its length, a main face that is the surface of the card with the largest area, and a transmitter/receiver (e.g. RF section 22a, 22b) that is connected to the pole-shaped antenna, wherein the longitudinal axis of the pole-shaped antenna is substantially parallel to the main face of the wireless transmission/reception card in a normal use state (Figs. 1, 2), and

wherein, when the wireless transmission/reception card is mounted on the mount, the pole-shaped antenna of the wireless transmission/reception card is set upright substantially in a vertical direction in the normal use state (Fig. 2).

Embodiments covered by claim 9 are directed to a wireless network terminal comprising:

a wireless transmission/reception card (e.g., Fig. 1);

a headset (headset 4); and

an electric appliance (e.g., notebook computer 13),
said wireless transmission/reception card comprises a pole-shaped antenna (e.g., antenna 2, 3) having a longitudinal axis along its length, a main face that is the surface of the card with the largest area, and a transmitter/receiver that is connected to the pole-shaped antenna, wherein the longitudinal axis of the pole-shaped antenna is substantially parallel to the main face of the wireless transmission/reception card in a normal use state (e.g., Fig. 1), and

 said headset includes a mount (e.g., slot 5, 6) on which the wireless transmission/reception card is mounted, the pole-shaped antenna of the wireless transmission/reception card being set upright substantially in a vertical direction in the normal use state when the wireless transmission/reception card is mounted on the mount (e.g., Fig. 2),

 wherein the headset and the electric appliance have communication interfaces compatible with each other (e.g., USB interfaces).

The Office Action alleges that receiver antenna 215 of Fig. 1b teaches the claimed pole-shaped antenna and receiver 210 of headset unit 205 teaches the claimed wireless transmission/reception card. The Office Action refers to these same devices for teaching features of claim 9.

 Headset unit 205 of Honore is only for receiving signals (e.g., it is referred to as "an entertainment reception device"), and antenna 215 is a "receiving antenna." Thus, Applicants submit that Honore fails to teach at least the claimed "transmitter/receiver."

 Accordingly, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* anticipation. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

§103(a) REJECTION – Honore, Maki

Claims 5, 8, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Honore in view of U.S. Patent 5,884,199 (Maki; previously cited). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5, 8, and 10 are dependent claims. At least for the reasons above for respective independent claims, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 5, 8, and 10, as well.

Furthermore, embodiments covered by claims 5, 8, and 11 include a “patch antenna.”

The Office Action admits that Honore fails to teach a patch antenna, and instead relies on Maki for making up for the deficiency. In particular, the Office Action alleges that GPS antenna 3 teaches the claimed patch antenna.

Maki is directed to a portable wireless receiver having a GPS antenna as a patch antenna. Maki teaches a main body 1 having an antenna for transmission/reception of radio waves by a transceiver unit (col. 2, lines 18-20). Thus, at most Maki teaches the modification of the headset unit of Honore to include a patch antenna for receiving GPS signals.

Because Maki’s patch antenna 3 only receives GPS signals, Applicants submit that Maki does not make up for the deficiency in Honore of failing to teach at least the claimed “transmitter/receiver.”

Accordingly, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

§103(a) REJECTION – Honore, Rydbeck

Claims 4, 7, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Honore in view of U.S. Patent 5,590,416 (Rydbeck; previously cited). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4, 7, and 10 are dependent claims. At least for the reasons above for respective independent claims, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 4, 7, and 10, as well.

Furthermore, embodiments covered by claims 4, 7, and 10 are directed to an embodiment including the feature of wherein the mount is rotatable.

The Office Action admits that Honore fails to teach this claimed feature, and instead relies on Rydbeck for making up for this deficiency.

Rydbeck is directed to an antenna for a cellular radiotelephone. The antenna in Rydbeck can be moved into a position that is directed away from a face of the radiotelephone in order to reduce electromagnetic shielding that would be caused by the user's head.

To the contrary, Applicants submit that Honore fails to teach that its receiver 210 has a face, and more importantly, that Honore's receiver antenna 215 would suffer from a problem of electromagnetic shielding caused by the user's head. Rather Honore's receiver is for receiving a short range signal 300 of public service bands reserved for personal communications (col. 4, lines 7-12). Honore's receiver is for personal or local transmission from a base entertainment unit (col. 3, lines 56-66). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that Honore's receiver is not for wireless communications. In other words, the teachings of Rydbeck do not apply to Honore, at least because Honore does not suffer from the problem addressed by Rydbeck.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that insufficient evidence is provided as a motivation to combine Rydbeck and Honore. At least for this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and drawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert Downs Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant